

# 02

Purpose and main principles of NBS monitoring

NBS impact assessment best practices from EU H2020 projects

**What constitutes NBS monitoring?**  
**How do I develop a robust NBS monitoring plan?**  
**How can I execute monitoring and impact assessment activities?**  
**What indicators of NBS impact can I use?**  
**How do I select appropriate indicators of NBS impact?**

Why is it important to evaluate the impacts of NBS?

How can I ensure NBS work for Disaster Risk Reduction?

What kinds of NBS monitoring data can I gather, and how should I manage these data?

## 2 PRINCIPLES GUIDING NBS PERFORMANCE AND IMPACT EVALUATION

**Coordinating Lead author**  
*Skodra, J.*

**Lead authors**  
*Connop, S., Tacnet, J.-M., Van Cauwenbergh, N.*

**Contributing authors**  
*Almassy, D., Baldacchini, C., Basco Carrera, L., Caitana, B., Cardinali, M., Feliu, E., Garcia, I., Garcia-Blanco, G., Jones, L., Kraus, F., Mahmoud, I., Maia, S., Morello, E., Pérez Lapeña, B., Pinter, L., Porcu, F., Reichborn-Kjennerud, K., Ruangpan, L., Rutzinger, M., Vojinovic, Z.*

### Summary

**What** is this chapter about?

In this chapter, you will learn the main principles guiding NBS performance and impact evaluation. Good evaluation can be the basis for effective NBS implementation, enable evidence-based policymaking, support policy learning and facilitate flexible decision-making, via adaptive management, to ensure the sustainable performance of NBS over time. Credible and appropriate impact evaluation is based on scientific evidence and end-user experiences, is properly scaled and is linked to policy directives.

First, we explain key terms such as performance, impact, monitoring and evaluation (Section 2.1). Then, in Section 2.2, we describe the critical role of performance and impact evaluation in supporting decision-making. In section 2.3 we respond the question: "How do you develop a credible and appropriate impact evaluation?" We propose a set of general steps and principles necessary to develop an NBS impact monitoring and evaluation (M&E) plan, and explain how to tailor this plan to the specific type and size of an NBS in your local context. Finally, we synthesise the issues related to the design of M&E plans based on practitioners' feedback from existing H2020 projects and provide several examples.

***How can I use this chapter in my work with NBS?***

This chapter provides an overview of the general steps and principles that are necessary to develop a credible impact monitoring and evaluation plan. The challenges and knowledge gaps that may arise during the definition of a monitoring and evaluation strategy are also explored in this chapter.

***When should I use this knowledge in my work with NBS?***

Chapter 2 should be used at the beginning of the planning process for NBS monitoring and impact assessment. Timely planning enables allocation of the necessary time and resources to develop and implement the impact evaluation plan, identify potential data gaps, and address funding constraints. These principles can be revisited after initiating NBS monitoring to ensure that all relevant and applicable steps of the process are being deployed.

***How does this chapter link with the other parts of the handbook?***

Chapter 2 introduces practical steps and principles for impact evaluation of NBS measures in urban and rural settings. The individual impact monitoring steps are further elaborated in Chapter 3.

---

## **2.1 Introduction and definitions**

Impact evaluation is part of a broader agenda of evidence-based policy-making and is essential to building knowledge about the effectiveness of interventions by highlighting what does and does not work to achieve desired change (Morton 2009). To achieve this, impact evaluation systematically and empirically examines the causal effects of the change in the built or natural environment associated with the NBS intervention. These effects can be grouped into 12 societal challenges<sup>32</sup> and often impact simultaneously across multiple dimensions (e.g., Place regeneration and Health and Wellbeing). Thus, impact evaluation is related to the interpretation of indicators selected to assess NBS performance

---

<sup>32</sup> Climate resilience, water management, natural and climate hazards, green space management, biodiversity enhancement, air quality, place regeneration, knowledge and social capacity building for sustainable urban transformation, participatory planning and governance, social justice and social cohesion, health and wellbeing, new economic opportunities and green jobs (see Chapter 4).

and effectiveness in addressing challenges and fulfilling objectives. The main aim of the impact evaluation is to answer a particular cause-and-effect question:

*What is the impact (or causal effect) of an NBS intervention on an outcome of interest?*

It is therefore essential to define in advance what impacts (or effects) an NBS intervention is expected to have, so that appropriate data at the appropriate scale (e.g., spatial and temporal) may be collected (Morton, 2009). Meaningful impact evaluation appropriately represents the NBS intervention in question and its context. It should be valid in all respects (e.g., providing for both internal and external validity<sup>33</sup>) and provide useful information that can help inform future directions. In order to understand why aspects of an intervention worked or did not work, additional information on characteristics of NBS intervention are necessary to understand the reasons for effectiveness (Morton, 2009) and the conditions necessary for replicating the results in different context. In that sense, significant support from monitoring is essential to complement the impact evaluation.

The main characteristics of monitoring and evaluation are described in the following paragraphs to enable differentiation between different approaches suitable for NBS impact assessment.

**Monitoring** is a continuous process that tracks:

- The *implementation* process in order to determine what takes place and when, during a project. The collected data are used to inform project implementation, day-to-day management (adaptive management, management of risk) and decisions related to effective implementation processes and governance, and addressing challenges associated with these processes.
- *NBS performance* against expected results (related to 12 societal challenges<sup>3</sup>) and compared with measurements of a reference situation (baseline). NBS performance is defined as the degree to which NBS address an identified challenge<sup>3</sup> and/or fulfil a specified objective in a specific place (territory), time and socio-economic context (Raymond et al., 2017). It measures:
  1. Change towards certain targets\* (in this case performance thresholds must be set - targets bring an additional challenge relating to how they are selected /set); or ,
  2. The change in relation to the Baseline/Reference; or,
  3. A combination of numbers 1 and 2.

---

<sup>33</sup> Internal validity refers to study design (factors like selection bias, spillovers, etc. should be addressed) and external validity refers to generalizability (applicability of lessons-learned to another context or conditions)

Performance can be assessed by comparing against results from before the intervention, from different NBS interventions or from alternative non-NBS interventions, and may also analyse trends over time. The collected (qualitative and quantitative) data is used to assess Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) needed in impact evaluations.

Monitoring is therefore a critical source of information about NBS performance (e.g., in terms of effectiveness, see Figure 2-1), including implementation and costs, which supports the evidence base for both new and existing NBS. Monitoring is used to reflect the reference situation before/without NBS and the situation after/with the NBS implementation. In order to generate the most relevant data from this process, monitoring should be conducted at an appropriate scale taking into consideration urban morphology and regional characteristics. A range of stakeholders may be involved in the local monitoring teams, in different forms of participation - from informative to co-monitoring activities.

Establishing a common standard for key indicators is important for comparing NBS effectiveness across cities or regions. This helps to make results transferable and thus support decision-makers in demonstrably effective and evidence-based design of interventions in the built environment as well as in the natural environment.

**Evaluation** is periodic, objective (un-biased, well-documented) assessment of a planned, ongoing, or completed NBS project used selectively to answer specific questions related to design, implementation, and results. It should be conducted at the appropriate scale (e.g., spatial and temporal) according to different decision-making contexts. In general, evaluations can address three types of questions (Morra Imas and Rist, 2009):

- Descriptive questions explore what is taking place related to conditions, processes and stakeholder views;
- Normative rating questions assess 'what is' taking place in comparison to 'what should be' taking place and apply to inputs, activities and outputs;
- Cause-and-effect questions explore what difference the NBS intervention makes to outcomes.

**Impact evaluation** mostly addresses the cause-and-effect questions. The basic evaluation question - what is the causal effect (impact) of an NBS intervention on an outcome of interest? – can be applied to different contexts. For example, what is the impact of the NBS on the mitigation of the adverse effects of hydro-meteorological risks (that at the same time deliver socio-economic and well-being benefits)? What is the impact of the residents' participation in the NBS co-creation on the use of the NBS, social cohesion and human health and well-being aspects? How can broadening the scope of the evaluation of NBS projects engage diverse funding sources necessary for city-wide implementation of NBS?

In that sense, impact evaluation focuses on the attribution and causality. To be able to establish the causal effect and to attribute it to the NBS intervention

different methods can be used. These methods should estimate what the outcome would have been for the area and for its users (residents, people working in that area, etc.) if the NBS had not been developed (Morton, 2009). Alternatively, is a given NBS intervention effective compared to the absence of the intervention or to alternative, traditional engineering or planning solution? According to the causality view, **X** (NBS intervention) causes **Y** (an outcome, e.g., alters microclimate or social cohesion) and without **X**, **Y** would not exist.

#### *Why are measurements needed in reference areas with no intervention?*

Impact evaluation should use appropriate methods to prove that an NBS intervention (X), rather than other changes in environment, society, etc. - has caused a specific outcome (Y). However, NBS full development and changes in the built environment usually take a longer period of time, during which other factors may change as well. Thus, a whole range of effects can occur in the meantime, that may change the behaviour and perception of the population but have nothing to do with the original NBS intervention. This can be a global crisis (such as the Corona pandemic), but also local events (such as particularly mild weather for a longer period of time or a good score in sports events) that may change the feeling of happiness of the population independently of the original intervention.

One of the methods to filter out these effects, to prove the causality (Morton, 2009) and be able to attribute the outcome to the NBS intervention is a comparison<sup>34</sup> of the *treated area* (NBS implemented) with a *control area* that has not received a treatment (no NBS implemented). If an outcome of interest, e.g. microclimate or social cohesion, has improved in both areas it means that there were other factors that caused that change, rather than the NBS intervention. In cases where an outcome of interest, microclimate or social cohesion, has improved only in the treated area, then that change can be attributed to the NBS intervention.

Treated and control area are assessed before (pre) and after (post-) -the NBS intervention. The main challenge is to identify a control area and construct population group that is as similar as possible to the treated area/group and be in time before the participation and implementation process begins. In that sense, timely planning of impact evaluation will enable allocation of the necessary time and resources, and minimise funding constraints.

The definition of suitable "control area/group" or "before/after status" may not be applicable in all cases, for example, where NBS are designed to mitigate hydro-meteorological risks with relatively long (>10 years) return periods, such as floods and droughts (see Chapter 6). Under such a scenario, modelling could be an option, or evaluation of the impact of NBS on less severe (and more frequent) events.

---

<sup>34</sup> Example of a comparison to determine the impact of a programme or policy  
<https://ec.europa.eu/jrc/en/research-topic/counterfactual-impact-evaluation>

For certain impact assessments of large-scale NBS, finding a suitable control area can be challenging. Ideally, the control area should have similar environmental and socio-economic conditions as the treated area but be located far enough to be unaffected by the NBS intervention (to avoid spillover effect). If no suitable control area can be identified, an alternative approach may be to predict what the situation would be in the project area without implementation of the NBS. This would become the reference situation to which post-NBS monitoring data could be compared to assess the impact of NBS.

### 2.1.1 The concept of effectiveness

NBS effectiveness is defined as:

*the degree to which objectives are achieved and the extent to which targeted problems are solved. In contrast to efficiency, effectiveness is determined without reference to costs (Raymond et al., 2017, p. vi).*


For example (based on Raymond et al., 2017):

- Does the NBS lead to enhanced climate resilience in the urban area?
- Does the NBS lead to environmental benefits?
- Does the NBS lead to social benefits?
- Does the NBS lead to economic benefits?
- Does the NBS lead to biodiversity benefits?

In cases when NBS interventions combine solutions to achieve different impacts, it is important to ensure that the impacts and its cumulative effects are integrated throughout the process rather than simply synthesised at the end (Morton 2009). This makes the whole analysis of their effects and impacts complex, increasing uncertainty with respect to data collection.

A functional analysis using safety and reliability analysis concepts (Figure 2-1) can help identifying the different system's components, their functions, their objectives and therefore their effectiveness. This methodology, classically used for technological systems is innovative and helpful to model the whole system and the interactions, as well as to break down the protected system into components with given functions. The concept of components' function and corresponding objectives identification is key to design and choose the best indicators for each application context. For example, a soakaway designed to divert road drainage can also be planted with shrubs and other plants to support pollinators. In that case, it is necessary to not only select indicators that measure the quantity of drainage waters diverted or extent of flooding avoided, but also indicators related to numbers of pollinators visiting flowers, etc. However, it is essential to avoid overlapping indicators in the projects' framework. Clustering of indicators can be handy for NBS effectiveness comparisons across cities or regions and help decision-makers to move towards better solutions.

Based on the project objectives the assessment of the performance and the effectiveness of a particular NBS intervention should take into account spatial and temporal scale as well as specific target groups. Important part of impact evaluations is an assessment of cost-benefit or cost-effectiveness. **Knowing which NBS interventions are effective and at what cost is crucial for informing decisions about whether an intervention could be scaled up and replicated.**



**Figure 2-1.** Effectiveness indicators are designed to measure the extent to which NBS capacity reaches the objective linked to an explicitly identified function (adapted from Tacnet et al., 2021)

Since benefits do not only refer to the physical sphere but include social/individual, economic, and ecological/environmental benefits as well, the complementary use of several evaluation approaches such as *ex ante simulations*, *mixed method analysis* (drawing on both qualitative and quantitative data), *modelling* and *process evaluations* can complement impact evaluations. It is therefore important to note that there are always alternative approaches to assess benefits, including those, which are non-monetisable. For a customised impact assessment, it may therefore be helpful to adapt methods to one another (e.g., by adding other dimensions to an already planned questionnaire) in order to arrive at an effective impact assessment. In addition, integrating assessment methods such as multi-criteria analysis or natural capital evaluation methods can be adopted.

## 2.2 Decision-making context and impact evaluations: from needs to indicators

This section provides a broad vision of decision-making contexts explaining why NBS impact evaluations are needed. The aim is to identify and describe the evaluation needs in general, independent of a specific project or objective.

Impact evaluation focuses on results of NBS interventions and provides a set of tools that stakeholders can use to verify and improve the quality, efficiency, and effectiveness of the interventions at various stages of implementation. Although impact evaluation is a core driver of decision-making, since it is resource (time and expertise) demanding it can remain a marginal activity. In that sense, *it is important that impact evaluation is designed at the early planning phases of an NBS intervention*, in order to allocate necessary resources, develop the stakeholder engagement strategy and, where possible, integrate citizen science in the design of the evaluation. Additionally, it is important that its value is thoroughly communicated in order to support appropriate mainstreaming and management.

In general, there are two main approaches to NBS impact evaluation:

1. NBS has already been developed in the past and the main aim is to determine whether the NBS intervention is effective (*retrospective impact evaluation, i.e., ex-post evaluation*). If NBS is already there and baseline data was not collected before the NBS was implemented, it is difficult to analyse whether the NBS is successfully implemented and whether the envisioned outcomes are achieved (challenges related to the selection of appropriate treated and control groups before the implementation). However, this can be done for specific indicators using data that was collected during the monitoring of the NBS and data collected for other purposes (e.g., regional statistics of city administration data).
2. NBS has to be chosen during the planning phase (in comparison to alternative solutions or business-as-usual, i.e., ex-ante evaluation including screening) and implemented. Impact evaluations are developed at the same time as the NBS intervention is being planned and are integrated into the NBS implementation (*prospective impact evaluation, i.e., ex-ante evaluation including screening*). Baseline data are collected before the NBS intervention is implemented for both the area and/or group receiving the intervention (the treated area/group) and the area/group used for comparison that is not receiving the intervention (the control area/group).

In both cases, the robust evidence generated by impact evaluations is important for greater accountability, innovation, and learning in a decision-making context. Learning and innovation demand a willingness to take risks and experiment. Interdisciplinary nature of impact evaluation can contribute to busting departmental silos and understanding broader benefits and co-benefits of NBS. The accountability is crucial when it comes to reporting to funders, influencing decision-makers and engaging novel funding streams (Gertler et al., 2016).



In that sense impact evaluations should provide credible evidence on performance of the NBS and on whether a particular NBS intervention has achieved or is achieving its envisioned outcomes. Impact evaluations require the interpretation of those indicators that have been chosen to assess the benefits and co-benefits over a period of time. In this respect, an important challenge is how to look at the different indicators as a whole, considering their variation at different time scales. It is also necessary to decide in advance how large an effect is desirable and establish thresholds of impact. This is required in order to design an evaluation with the appropriate degree of statistical power to be able to detect an effect of the size expected. However, it is important to avoid a situation whereby even a smallest change is interpreted as a success or failure of the NBS (Gertler et al., 2016).

The question concerning uncertainty and more generally information imperfection is very important here. Information imperfection (including uncertainty) can apply to data features (e.g., resolution, coverage/spatial extent, etc.) and come from type and reliability of sources (number of monitoring locations, experts) and also from the evaluation procedure, measurement method or model themselves. This is an important aspect as it carries the weight and reliability of recommendations that will come from the monitoring and evaluation work. In that sense, it is recommended to assess and propagate information quality during the process of evaluation. The risk of failure of the monitoring system requires the development of protocols to adopt mitigation measures in case a failure in the monitoring system is detected.

In the decision-making context, the ability to replicate results is fundamental to questions about the broader effectiveness and scalability of a particular NBS. In addition to assessing the effectiveness of NBS in terms of desirable outcomes, it is important to carefully trace a theory of change<sup>35</sup> that explains the process through which NBS intervention has achieved the final outcome (benefits, co-benefits, but also unintended negative effects). As illustrated in Figure 2-2, the process begins with determining the desired long-term impacts related to the project objectives/challenges (vision). Proceeding from the identification of the existing conditions (reality), the necessary inputs and outputs are identified to achieve short-term as well as intermediate outcomes, which themselves lead to the desired long-term impact (vision). Assumptions identify the locally specific risks and conditions that are present in the project's context and attempt to manage these risks by identifying what conditions must hold true for change to occur. Understanding the process through which the changes have been implemented enables the identification of causal pathways (Morton, 2009), explaining:

- how the development of NBS functions in producing outputs, and
- how the process of producing outputs influences the final outcome.

---

<sup>35</sup> A theory of change is a description of how an intervention is intended to deliver the desired results. It describes the causal logic of how and why a particular program or intervention will reach its intended outcomes. A theory of change is a key underpinning of any impact evaluation, given the cause-and-effect focus of the research (Gertler et al., 2016, p. 32).



**Figure 2-2.** Example of the Theory of Change  
(simplified adapted from The Young Foundation, CLEVER Cities project - D4.3/ WP4, pp. 18)

In order to gain a full picture of results, it is necessary to combine impact evaluations with monitoring and complementary evaluation approaches (i.e., to determine was the NBS implemented as planned, to provide context and explanations to quantitative analysis – qualitative data and mixed methods<sup>36</sup>). Moreover, in the decision-making context a long-term, transdisciplinary studies that focus on comparisons between NBS and non-NBS alternatives are very valuable to policy-makers (Dick et al., 2020).

NBS are always implemented to fulfil a range of specified functions (e.g., reducing floods, reducing air temperature, etc.), which can relate either to a quantifiable parameters (e.g., water storage volume) or to a qualitative metric such as an index to assess the well-being of a population.


In practice, assessing NBS’ effectiveness can be seen as several decision-making problems:

- a) Choosing - what is the most effective NBS?
- b) Sorting - to which category of effectiveness or impact (low, medium, or high) does the NBS belong?
- c) Ranking - what is the effectiveness of NBS ranking from the worst to the best (or vice versa)?

Multi-criteria decision analysis (MCDA)<sup>37</sup> is a way to gather any kind of qualitative and quantitative criteria, which correspond to NBS impacts (Figure 2-3; see Langemeyer et al., 2020; Harrison et al., 2017).

<sup>36</sup> Mixed methods – an expert or a team of experts from different disciplines seeks to integrate quantitative and qualitative approaches to theory, data collection, data analysis and interpretation. The purpose is to strengthen the reliability of data, validity of the findings and recommendations, and to broaden and deepen our understanding of the processes through which program outcomes and impacts are achieved, and how these are affected by the local context. (Bamberger, 2012)

<sup>37</sup> [More information on multi-criteria decision analysis \(MCDA\)](#), PP.129-139



**Figure 2-3.** The analysis of the effectiveness or impact of NBS can be done through a combination of decision-aiding approaches and thematic, expert analysis and indicators. Features related to impact (effects) of NBS are combined in a multicriteria decision-making framework including technical (T), organisational (O) – not represented, physical (P), human (H), economic (E) and Environmental (E) considerations (TOPHEE framework) (Tacnet et al., 2021, based on the NAIAID project D5.4).


In practice, those criteria can be linked to measurable indicators coming from thematic, expert analysis. An interesting point is that it is a multidisciplinary framework, which can easily link deterministic, physical assessments and a global aggregated model as shown in Figure 2-3. In addition, this allows differentiation between factual, objective assessment and more subjective evaluation based on decision-makers' preferences.

Planning frameworks move proactively towards adaptive planning and management models, as a response to uncertainty and as an option to effectively harness resilience (adapted from IUCN, 2020<sup>38</sup>). In this context, it is imperative that NBS implementation includes provisions to enable this adaptive planning and management, generating evidence-base provided by regular monitoring and evaluation, drawing on local knowledge as well as on scientific understanding. NBS effectiveness and continuous performance evaluation are relevant throughout the life-cycle of the intervention for identifying deviations, maximizing synergies and total impacts, assessing and mitigating potential trade-offs, and minimizing stranded investments.

<sup>38</sup> <https://www.iucn.org/theme/nature-based-solutions/resources/iucn-global-standard-nbs>

## 2.3 Principles for the development of impact monitoring and evaluation plans

Since evaluation plans are developed to evaluate benefits, co-benefits, and negative effects as well as to evaluate performance of NBS in achieving predefined objectives, this may require combining results of several impact evaluations (each requiring its individual impact evaluation plan). The first section lists general steps in designing and implementing an impact evaluation plan (Figure 2-4). The second section presents main principles that should be followed when developing steps of impact evaluations plans (Figure 2-4).



**Figure 2-4.** General steps and main principles involved in the development and implementation of an impact evaluation plan.

### 2.3.1 Steps

The design of an impact evaluation plan is a multi-faceted process. Based on the literature review and existing NBS projects we list six steps for developing impact monitoring and evaluation plans. This is a general overview that will be explained in more detail in Chapter 3.

**STEP 1:** Constructing and adopting a theory of change (Figure 2-2), which helps to identify objectives and challenges, as well as outlining the process for achieving the intended outcomes and impacts.

**STEP 2:** Developing a results chain to outline the theory of change – this covers both the implementation process and the results outcomes.

**STEP 3:** Specifying the evaluation question(s), the basic impact evaluation question is 'What is the impact (or causal effect) of an NBS intervention on an

outcome of interest?’ The focus is on the Impact - the changes directly attributable to an NBS intervention.

**STEP 4:** Selecting indicators and gathering data that answer the evaluation question(s) and that allow the assessment of *performance* and *process*: ‘Does NBS operate as designed and is it consistent with the planned theory of change?’ Critical selection of indicators that will be used to measure success/effectiveness of the NBS intervention, as well as cause-and-effect indicators should focus the evaluation, establish link to interventions well-defined objectives and assure that outcome is attributable to the NBS.

**STEP 5:** Implementing the impact evaluation, evaluating positive/negative features of NBS impacts related to the different challenges<sup>39</sup>, analysing and interpreting the findings.

**STEP 6:** Disseminating results and achieving policy impact

### 2.3.2 Principles

A proper assessment and evaluation of the targeted impacts is needed in a way that is relevant and useful firstly to immediate end users and secondly to inform broader policy processes. Therefore, development of impact monitoring and evaluation plans should consider a few universal principles. Impact evaluation plans and its indicators must:

1. Be scientifically sound,
2. Be practical and straight-forward,
3. Use reference conditions and baseline assessment,
4. Align with policy principles and reporting obligations,
5. Be based on a transdisciplinary approach.

These principles are explained below. Examples of the implementation of these principles can be found in the selected NBS project example boxes between each chapter.

---

<sup>39</sup> In this Handbook impacts of nature-based solutions are assessed across 12 societal challenge areas: Climate Resilience; Water Management; Natural and Climate Hazards; Green Space Management; Biodiversity; Air Quality; Place Regeneration; Knowledge and Social Capacity Building for Sustainable Urban Transformation; Participatory Planning and Governance; Social Justice and Social Cohesion; Health and Well-being; New Economic Opportunities and Green Jobs – see Chapter 4

1) Impact evaluation should be scientifically sound

Since impact evaluations measure the change in an outcome that is attributable to a defined NBS intervention, it is based on models of cause-and-effect. It requires a credible and rigorously defined study design to control for factors other than the intervention. However, cause-effects are not necessarily the only model. In cases when the purpose of impact evaluation is raising awareness of the impact of the NBS, the crucial factor is engagement of communities and decision-makers. In that case, attribution may be replaced with contribution analysis<sup>40</sup>. Ideally, in a Theory of Change, aspects such as ‘community engagement’ can also be assessed to demonstrate success of the project.

Measuring the impact of an NBS intervention should follow a concrete selection of appropriate methodology that is capable of assessing the Key Performance Indicators (or KPIs). Quantification and assessment of indicators is needed for every challenge (environmental, economic, social or other<sup>4</sup>). But how to select or develop indicators to be scientifically sound? This handbook provides an extended list of scientifically sound indicators (Chapter 4) and examples of their application (Chapter 5). The accompanying Appendix of Methods provides full descriptions of each indicator and provides a brief methodology for each.

In case further indicators are necessary, based on a scientific literature the following criteria can be used for their development (Figure 2-5):




Figure 2-5. Criteria for developing ecosystem service indicators (adapted from Van Oudenhoven et al., 2018)

<sup>40</sup> Contribution Analysis is a structured approach that enables assessing real-world challenges. It consists of a step-wise, iterative process of refining Theory of Change. It does not seek to conclusively prove whether, or how far, a development intervention has contributed to a change. Instead it seeks to reduce uncertainty (<https://www.intrac.org/wpcms/wp-content/uploads/2017/01/Contribution-analysis.pdf>).

1. *Credibility*: the process of indicator development should be based on a review of existing literature and on an external review by experts, controlled path of production, elaboration, validation and monitoring of data according to scientific protocols and methodologies: scientific selection methods, validation, integration into methodology, triangulation of data.
2. *Salience*: relates to the capacity of indicators to convey useful and relevant information for decision makers about specific objectives as perceived by potential end-users and stakeholders. It is important to use effective means to present and translate scientific indicators in a way that it is easy to communicate to non-experts: easy to read, understandable and not generating misunderstanding (visualisation, modelling and simulation tools: such as graphical, GIS, tabular, model animations, landscape design drawings, etc.). Indicators should be temporary explicit to have the potential to monitor change and assess progress over time. Moreover, indicators should be scalable and transferable.
3. *Legitimacy*: selection on the basis of relevant indicators to meet the scopes of monitoring process (for example, SMART<sup>41</sup>): the selection of the most appropriate model of impact evaluation will depend mainly on vision and outcomes of interest in the project, scale of implementation, desired co-benefits and available resources allocated to monitoring work and time. The impact monitoring and evaluation plans need to be iterated and co-produced with the relevant stakeholders and experts from different disciplines (see principle 5 on transdisciplinarity) and not be a one-way communication or design. In addition, indicators should be the outcome of a shared process, to meet the expectations of a wide number of stakeholders and, where possible, to express the engagement of communities in decision-making and raise the awareness.
4. *Feasibility*: relates to the sufficiency of data, time and resources to assess and monitor indicators (simple indicators are easy to acquire, easy to elaborate, assess, and monitor over time). Another crucial aspect to the scientific appropriateness of impact evaluation models is checking beforehand the availability of baseline data, as well as, the (economic, temporal, ethical) feasibility of measuring new data or collecting new information throughout the monitoring process to get down the road.

## **2) Impact evaluation should be practical and straightforward but fulfil technical requirements**

Impact evaluation has to be practical and straightforward, including when planned by scientists and conducted by experts. This implies that many barriers should be overcome in communicating (and making aware of) the final aim of the monitoring activity, to assure it is successful and well conducted.

---

<sup>41</sup> SMART Specific, Measurable, Attributable, Realistic, and Timely or Time-bound, see Chapter 3

Since every NBS project is unique, measuring of impact/outcome needs to be adjusted to that specific project and context. Although no universal framework can be proposed, some basic requirements for a successful monitoring activity are listed below.

- A high level, cooperative dialogue among practitioners, local or regional authorities, stakeholders and scientists should occur from the beginning of developing the monitoring and impact evaluation plans (see point 5) on transdisciplinarity)

*This will help practitioners, local or regional authorities and stakeholders to be more aware about the critical aspects of a scientifically robust assessment, as well as help scientists to focus more on the challenges that really need to be tackled by the NBS intervention.*

- Definition of the scope in which effects of the intervention are expected
- Definition of the site of investigation and/or target groups

*The site of investigation can be the NBS site, its neighbourhood, its district, the whole city or region. The target group is located within this spatial limit and it should be as statistically representative as possible (see Chapter 3 and Chapter 7).*

- Choice of a control area/group (when applicable)

*In many cases outside factors may influence outcome of the NBS intervention. In order to validate the monitoring results and correlate them with the NBS intervention realized, a parallel, twin, monitoring activity should be performed elsewhere, by identifying the so-called "control area/group". It should be as identical as possible to the actual treated area/group. This usually means that it should be located in the same neighbourhood/district/city/region (depending on the scale at which effects are expected, by scaling a level up the spatial scale) in order to take local conditions (e.g., climatic conditions or cultural ones) into account. For instance: if NBS effects are expected at the district level, the control area/group should be chosen within the same city or region but in a different district.*

- Choice of a reliable and feasible frequency of data collection

*Reliable frequency of the data collection should ensure the impact evaluation on a temporal scale, which is adapted to the type of intervention and/or of the challenge to be faced. However, data collection frequency should be also feasible (see Figure 2-5), since regional authorities, municipalities or stakeholders generally have limited budget/persons to do this.*

### **3) Impact evaluations should clearly state and use reference conditions and baseline assessment**



Baseline data are important for measuring pre-intervention outcomes (reference conditions) that are used later in the assessment process for the before-and-after comparison. Chapter 7 of this handbook discusses how baseline data are established and used operationally. In this section we list the following key points:

- Ensure that the method for establishing baseline data is repeatable
- Differentiate between process and outcome
- Chose standardized ways of assessing certain outcomes to allow for the accumulation of evidence and comparability; striking a balance between common indicators and highly specific ones;
- Assure clear link between challenges addressed and indicators selected
- Establish baseline and control area/group or reference values for comparison in order to determine change(s) attributable to NBS implementation

#### **4) Impact evaluation should align with policy principles and reporting obligations.**

The expected outcomes based on objectives of an NBS intervention are important for the impact evaluation. However, it is also important to identify and include unexpected outcomes. Considering the time-frame of the project and the time necessary for outcomes to be 'visible', some impacts may occur more quickly than others.

In that sense, short-term immediately visible improvements are initial outcomes that can be assessed immediately after the intervention (green quality, aesthetic, amenities, etc.). Intermediate outcomes are assessable after some period of time during the project (use and function of NBS, individual status and perception, social environment) while long-term health outcomes (mortality rates, life expectancy, cardiovascular disease, obesity, etc.) are often difficult to assess; either because there is no long-term monitoring institutionalized, but also because these outcomes are influenced by many interweaving factors. Moreover, achieved positive impacts might change over time (depending on management, succession, changing climate, etc.).

To assure relevance for policy-makers, it is also important to seek alignment with key policy objectives. This can be done through a strategic review of policy alignment between local/regional/national strategic objectives and potential NBS benefits. The desired impact from the NBS implementation process can then feed into the local administration, urban or regional policies (e.g., green roofs mitigation and adaptation measure).

This should also provide connection to the local, national and EU-based policies and requirements. For example, NATURA 2000 may require from all member states to use certain indicators in the assessment of their natural areas. Similarly,

Floods Directive will specify those indicators that are related to flood risk assessment. Water Framework Directive demands certain water quality standards and indicators. Similarly, the LIFE programme<sup>42</sup>, the EU's funding instrument for the environment and climate action, has developed a KPI framework that can be seen as embedding element for measuring the impact of a NBS. However, indicators in this Handbook (Chapter 4) are based on H2020 Projects involving EU and non-EU cities and regions and are thus applicable globally.

## **5) Impact evaluation should be based on a transdisciplinary<sup>43</sup> approach.**

Impact evaluation of NBS interventions relates to a whole range of different societal challenges. It is unlikely that the knowledge required for such broad evaluation sits with a single individual. As such, monitoring and evaluation teams should engage societal actors and experts from across relevant disciplines in a transdisciplinary approach. A transdisciplinary approach enables combining knowledge from societal actors with knowledge and methods from different disciplines (e.g., engineering, public health, social sciences, etc.) (Schneider et al., 2019). To achieve transdisciplinarity, monitoring and evaluation plans should be co-produced in collaborative actions to achieve the best balance between local needs, values and knowledge, and scientific interdisciplinary knowledge and requirements. Local authorities and practitioners, who are aware of real conditions as well as administrative and technical barriers, should drive collaborative actions. However, they should also involve additional expertise, for example from the civic sector (to identify local needs and raise the awareness about the benefits related to NBS), industry (to contribute to feasibility), and scientists.

The co-production process should start with identifying a joint vision (Theory of Change, Figure 2-2) and establishing desired outcomes collaboratively from the beginning. By approaching co-production this way, it will be easier to relate outcomes to the planned NBS, to expected results, and to the indicators that will be used to measure the expected impact. Support from the local community is crucial as this not only improves the quality of information and trust in the results of the impact evaluation itself, but also raises awareness and increases sense of stewardship and caring. Likewise, partnerships and collaborations among actors that are normally not in contact with each other can be generated. Allowing different partners to get involved in participatory decision-making will generate a sense of ownership of the solutions to be implemented (see also Mahmoud and Morello, 2021). Their involvement will bring diverse perspectives in defining outcomes, selecting indicators, collecting and analysing data.

Support from the scientific community or other experts is desirable when deciding what methods or research designs will be considered credible for the impact evaluation. This handbook is already driven by scientific principles and should

---

<sup>42</sup> [The LIFE Programme](#)

<sup>43</sup> Transdisciplinarity – problem-driven, cross-disciplinary, cooperative approach including scientists, practitioners, stakeholders.

facilitate selection of suitable monitoring tools and protocols that can be adapted to the local needs.

In that sense, it would be desirable that local administrations and practitioners in collaboration with stakeholders and scientists interested in the implementation and monitoring of a NBS:

- Tailor the monitoring protocols, while preserving the scientific robustness;
- Choose the needed experimental setup according to the required resolution and disciplines; and,
- Follow up regarding the process during short and long-terms implementation processes.

## **2.4 Capitalising on existing experiences and remaining critical concerns**

Impact evaluation of NBS interventions requires joint effort of different actors to be able to assess wide range of outcomes and identify trade-offs before, during and after the NBS implementation. A high-quality impact evaluation depends on skills of team members conducting the study. However, even with a skilled team, evaluation processes may face different challenges. In the following sections, we describe challenges and gaps from H2020 projects and conclude with key messages based on existing experiences from these projects.

### *2.4.1 Challenges and gaps in current monitoring and evaluation efforts*

Impact evaluation is related to the interpretation of indicators selected to assess NBS performance and effectiveness in addressing challenges and fulfilling objectives. A number of common challenges and gaps in monitoring and evaluation efforts are emerging from the existing NBS projects. These challenges are analysed from four perspectives: practitioner, scientific, citizen/user and private sector.

**From a practitioner perspective** main challenges are identified from project work with stakeholders in cities and regions. They include a lack of expertise in evaluation and data collection, in the critical selection of indicators that address the predefined impacts; short time frames; dispersed and siloed data within different agencies; lack of implementation monitoring vs. performance monitoring (which could lead to the missing of important data afterwards, such as for the accounting of the cost-benefit and cost-effectiveness); etc. Problems of dispersed and siloed data can partly be solved with transdisciplinary approach, which enables the effective gathering of data from many different disciplines (health, air quality, biodiversity, water management, economics, etc.) and effective communication with those who hold those data.

The use of indicators themselves has following practical issues:

- Indicators exist but it is difficult to use them due to the lack of understanding (e.g., understanding the logic behind the models), data unavailability, data not available for use at fine scale (e.g., detailed census data may be available at household level but cannot be released), etc.
- Lack of resources, lack of ownership, lack of requirement from funders, lack of interest once NBS has been installed, lack of expertise, change in personnel
- Issues related to the complexity of cities and regions, as a system of systems with several layers of networks constantly interacting with each other, which makes it difficult to identify causal chains (especially when people and their behaviour are the target of interest)
- The multiplicity of decision-making contexts and processes cannot be captured by a universal and versatile set of indicators: each decision requires the selection of ad-hoc indicators from among an extended set. Formalisation of all those decisions is not always fully understood by the different stakeholders who may expect easy ready-to-use methods working in any conditions.
- Feasibility based on the available expertise (e.g., biomonitoring).

**From a scientific perspective,** (see section 2.3.2) the main gaps in the monitoring process are:

- Lack of differentiation between the process and outcome, the gaps in the monitoring methodology and implementation stages (micro-, meso-, macro-, etc. scales of interventions) and longer-time frame of effects measurement.
- Lack of longer-term evaluations to assess effects over time and guaranteeing continuity of monitoring measurements: often models of monitoring impacts lack the continuity of measurement from the pre-greening to the long-term effects in the post-greening phase, they are also influenced by the complexity and feasibility of the monitoring itself. The ideal impact monitoring methodologies are the ones with the minimum specialised equipment and time efforts, or relying on ready-to-run and consolidated data acquisition protocols, possibly managed by the public authority. Involving citizens and local stakeholders in the co-monitoring of NBS interventions, often requires simplification, which is challenging for some complex impacts.
- Difficulties in communicating to non-scientific partners in a less -technical language. Engaging stakeholders in the process of data collection and monitoring is challenging. However, scientists should translate indicators to be simple and capable of immediate representation, easy to understand and, connected to people's priority interests and concerns.

- Ability to express levels of uncertainty associated with evaluation outcomes. Decision-makers want to know what is the relative level of certainty or uncertainty associated with evaluation work. For example, speaking in practical terms, if the likely chance of an NBS achieving its intended impact is 80% then decision-makers may be very willing to up-scale such an NBS intervention elsewhere, as opposed to their willingness to upscale if the likelihood of achieving the desired impact is only 20%.
- Indicators exist but they may not be relevant to the studied NBS in a place-based context. The way indicators are assessed (quantitative, qualitative, traceability/justification of hypothesis) is essential.
- Any set of indicators will always remain contextual and correspond to the knowledge level at a given moment: it is therefore interesting to provide lists of indicators but also methodologies to build new ones in a dynamic way if needed.
- Measurability of intangible impacts (e.g., aesthetic enjoyment) and spillovers (impact of NBS intervention may spread beyond the treated area or group) as well as accounting for trade-offs is challenging, particularly because of the diverse perspectives of stakeholder valuing NBS, the multiple time scales of assessment and influence of other programs and factors.
- The assessment of NBS effectiveness or impacts is a multi-scale and multi-temporal problem. Indicators for urban scales and issues may not be relevant for wider scale such as catchment basin scale for example when dealing with flood risk reduction.
- Indicators related to NBS effectiveness require the use of multi-disciplinary approaches able to combine physical, environmental, social, human and economic features. New paradigms are needed to integrate this different kind of knowledge and related methods.

**From citizens/users perspective:** experience with citizen monitoring is limited and collected data about the impacts of NBS is often not presented in a user-friendly format and/or made available to the public. Need for scientific and intercultural translation, lack of appropriation and adequate tools for co-diagnostic, co-evaluation and co-monitoring that involve citizens as active actors in the evaluation processes. Adoption of tools that include: the perception of citizens, the translation and adaptation of content, the validation of monitoring results by citizens. To consider people's voices, is to recognize the plurality and open paths for effective co-production of knowledge, see section 2.3.2.

**From a private sector perspective:** in some cases, NBS are elaborated in collaboration with industries and partners from the private sector. This is particularly true when the NBS implementation includes regeneration of previously productive sites and/or includes the implementation of innovation technologies. In all these cases, to have valuable inputs, beyond the non-monetisable benefits, is a real challenge.

In addition to the four perspectives, we identify three types of issues in NBS implementation of monitoring and evaluation plans: technical, physical and social. Some NBS which have been selected through the previous steps of building a theory of change and which encompass an evaluation model (e.g., SMART) have encountered a variety of hindrances in their actual implementation contexts, such as:

- Technical issues: some NBS in place require a specific sophisticated technical knowledge that is not necessarily available in project competences.
- Physical issues: some NBS in place have shown physical constraints or drawbacks that might obstruct the implementation in reality or induce unexpected side effects (e.g., a riparian forest causing woody debris and bridges' section reduction or even closure, see NAIAD project, La Brague demonstration site).
- Social issues: a social acceptance factor towards implementation is needed for any NBS impact model evaluation to measure an increase in openness, awareness, citizen engagement and to assess management efficiency, accountability, sharing, transparency, and communication. That is why a transdisciplinary approach is needed in order to facilitate the co-production of monitoring and evaluation plans with stakeholders.

In these cases, where the foreseen monitoring and evaluation plans cannot be implemented, mitigation measures have to be applied.

#### 2.4.2 Key messages from existing projects

NBS performance and impact evaluations should provide answers to policy questions that affect people's daily lives. In H2020 projects questions such as 'Does an NBS intervention influence air quality, enable climate adaptation, regulate microclimate, increase biodiversity or contribute to social cohesion and well-being?' are related to societal challenges. Key messages from these projects are listed below.

Three core elements of well-designed NBS performance and impact evaluation are:

1. A concrete assessment *question* related to an outcome of interest developed in a theory of change that can be answered with the impact evaluation.
2. A robust *methodology* that balances understanding of the complexity of diverse NBS outcomes, as well as trade-offs, with feasibility in relation to the specific socio-economic context and available resources.
3. A well-formed evaluation *team* that functions as a transdisciplinary partnership between different sectors (public, private, civil society) and various knowledge disciplines depending on the type of NBS and outcomes of interest.

It is important to have a practical focus and adapt these very general steps and principles to local context and develop tailor-made monitoring and evaluation plans. Moreover, don't be afraid to start small and begin with evaluation indicators that are more manageable and understandable. This can represent a good foundation for the development of a transdisciplinary evaluation plan.

When developing such bespoke plans, although local practitioners and the local population are crucial for plan development, it is also necessary to engage experts from different disciplines to ensure that various benefits and co-benefits as well as unintended negative effects of NBS interventions are assessed and evaluated. Although impact evaluations are complex processes with dynamic parts, they are a worthwhile investment and collaboration can be the most effective way to maximise the return on this investment.

Participants in the NBS impact evaluation should be included in the dissemination efforts. Since they have invested their time and energy in planning and implementing monitoring and evaluation plans, it is essential to ensure that they have access to and remain informed about the evaluation results. This small effort can contribute to their continued interest and willingness to participate in future NBS evaluations.

On the following pages and between chapters there are different case studies illustrating main characteristics and challenges of monitoring and evaluation plans from different H2020 projects. Chapter 3 explains step-by-step the process of development of monitoring and evaluation plans, which complements the general overview provided in this chapter.

## 2.5 References

- Baldacchini, C., Sgrigna, G., Clarke, W., Tallis, M., and Calfapietra, C., 'An ultra-spatially resolved method to quali-quantitative monitor particulate matter in urban environment', *Environmental Science and Pollution Research*, Vol. 26, 2019, pp. 18719–18729.
- Bamberger, M., 'Introduction to Mixed Methods in Impact Evaluation', *Impact Evaluation Notes*, No 3, 2012. Available from: <https://www.interaction.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/03/Mixed-Methods-in-Impact-Evaluation-English.pdf>
- CLEVER Cities project, *D4.3 Monitoring strategy in the FR interventions*, 2020. Available from: [https://clevercities.eu/fileadmin/user\\_upload/Resources/CLEVER\\_D4.3\\_Monitoring\\_Strategy\\_in\\_the\\_FR\\_interventions\\_vF2.pdf](https://clevercities.eu/fileadmin/user_upload/Resources/CLEVER_D4.3_Monitoring_Strategy_in_the_FR_interventions_vF2.pdf)
- Dick, J., Carruthers-Jones, J., Carver, S., Dobel, A.J., and Miller, J.D., 'How are nature-based solutions contributing to priority societal challenges surrounding human well-being in the United Kingdom: a systematic map', *Environmental Evidence*, Vol. 9, 2020, pp. 1–21.
- Dick, J., Miller, J.D., Carruthers-Jones, J., Dobel, A.J., Carver, S., Garbutt, A., Hester, A., Hails, R., Magreehan, V., and Quinn, M., 'How are nature based solutions contributing to priority societal challenges surrounding human well-being in the United Kingdom: A systematic map protocol', *Environmental Evidence*, Vol. 8, 2019, pp. 1–11.
- Funnell, S. and Rogers, P., *Purposeful Program Theory: Effective Use of Theories of Change and Logic Models*, Jossey-Bass/Wiley, San Francisco, 2011.
- Gertler, P.J., Martinez, S., Premand, P., Rawlings, L.B., and Vermeersch, C.M., *Impact evaluation in Practice*, Second Edition, Inter-American Development Bank and World Bank, Washington, DC, 2016. Available from: <https://www.worldbank.org/en/programs/sief-trust-fund/publication/impact-evaluation-in-practice>

- Harrison, P.A., Dunford, R., Barton, D.N., Kelemen, E., Martín-López, B., Norton, L., Termansen, M., Saaikoski, H., Hendriks, K., Gómez-Baggethun, E., Czúcz, B., García-Llorente, M., Howard, D., Jacobs, S., Karlsen, M., Kopperoinen, L., Madsen, A., Rusch, G., van Eupen, M., Verweij, P., Smith, R., Tuomasjukka, D., and Zulian, G., 'Selecting methods for ecosystem service assessment: A decision tree approach', *Ecosystem Services*, Vol. 29, 2018, pp. 481–498.
- Langemeyer, J., Wedgwood, D., McPhearson, T., Baró, F., Madsen, A.L. and Barton, D.N., 'Creating urban green infrastructure where it is needed – A spatial ecosystem service-based decision analysis of green roofs in Barcelona', *Science of The Total Environment*, Vol. 707, 2020, 135487.
- Mahmoud, I. and Morello, E., 'Co-creation Pathway for Urban Nature-Based Solutions: Testing a Shared-Governance Approach in Three Cities and Nine Action Labs', *Smart and Sustainable Planning for Cities and Regions*, Springer International Publishing, 2021, pp. 259–276.
- Morra Imas, L.G. and Rist, R., *The Road to Results: Designing and Conducting Effective Development Evaluations*, World Bank, 2009.
- Morton, M.H., *Applicability of Impact Evaluation to Cohesion Policy, Report Working Paper*, 2009. Available from: [https://ec.europa.eu/regional\\_policy/archive/policy/future/pdf/4\\_morton\\_final-formatted.pdf](https://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/archive/policy/future/pdf/4_morton_final-formatted.pdf)
- Pintér, L., Hardi, P., Martinuzzi, A., and Hall, J., 'Bellagio STAMP: Principles for sustainability assessment and measurement', *Ecological Indicators*, Vol. 17, 2012, pp. 20–28.
- ProGIreg, *Methodology on spatial analysis in front-runner and follower cities*, 2018. Available from: <https://progireg.eu/resources/planning-implementing-nbs/>
- Raymond, C.M., Berry, P., Breil, M., Nita, M.R., Kabisch, N., de Bel, M., Enzi, V., Frantzeskaki, N., Geneletti, D., Cardinaletti, M., Lovinger, L., Basnou, C., Monteiro, A., Robrecht, H., Sgrigna, G., Munari, L. and Calafapietra, C., *An Impact Evaluation Framework to Support Planning and Evaluation of Nature-based Solutions Projects, An EKLIPSE Expert Working Group report*, Centre for Ecology and Hydrology, Wallingford, 2017.
- Rogers, P.J., 'Matching Impact Evaluation Design to the Nature of the Intervention and the Purpose of the Evaluation', *Journal of Development Effectiveness*, Vol. 1, No 3, 2009, pp. 217– 226.
- Schneider, F., Giger, M., Harari, N., Moser, S., Oberlack, C., Providoli, I., Schmid, L., Tribaldos, T. and Zimmermann, A., 'Transdisciplinary co-production of knowledge and sustainability transformations: Three generic mechanisms of impact generation', *Environmental Science and Policy*, Vol. 102, 2019, pp. 26–35.
- Tacnet, J.-M., Piton, G., Favier, P., Pengal, P., Curt, C., Yordanova, R., Van Cauwenbergh, N., Giordano, R., *Natural Based Solutions choice and effectiveness assessment: Integrative modelling and decision-aiding framework*, Editions Quae, Versailles, 2021 (submitted).
- van Oudenhoven, A.P., Schröter, M., Drakou, E.G., Geijzendorffer, I.R., Jacobs, S., van Bodegom, P.M., Chazee, L., Czúcz, B., Grunewald, K., Lillebø, A.I., Mononen, L., Nogueira, A.J.A., Pacheco-Romero, M., Perennou, C., Remme, R.P., Rova, S., Sybre, R.-U., Tratalos, J.A., Vallejos, M., and Albert, C., 'Key criteria for developing ecosystem service indicators to inform decision making', *Ecological Indicators*, Vol. 95, No 1, 2018, pp. 417–426.
- White, S. and Pettit, J., 'Participatory Methods and the Measurement of Wellbeing', *Participatory Learning and Action*, Vol. 50, 2004, pp. 88–96.





**Drawing on knowledge from projects  
funded by the European Union**

# CONNECTING NATURE

**Bringing cities to life, bringing life into cities**

**Genk (BE) Glasgow (GB) Poznań (PL) A Coruña (ES) Burgas (BG)**

**Ioannina (GR) Málaga (ES) Nicosia (CY) Pavlos Melas (GR) Sarajevo (BA)**

**Brings in actions to feed the initiation and expansion of economic and social enterprises in production and large-scale implementation of NBS in urban settings to measure the impact of these initiatives on climate change adaptation, health and well-being, social cohesion and sustainable economic development.**



## Approach to Impact Assessment

The project developed indicators working co-creatively with our Front-runner cities. The goals behind both past and planned NBS projects, and the associated benefits and co-benefits delivered were explored. These criteria were used to filter a comprehensive list of indicators to identify which were recommended 'core' (i.e., had key relevance for all cities across all NBS), and which were additional 'feature' (i.e., had potential relevance, but were more specific to individual NBS). The results were sense-checked with the city teams, and then different options were developed for implementing each indicator dependent upon the expertise and capacity within each city. The indicators were implemented in the cities, to ensure that a diverse evidence base of benefits is available to unlock broader funding and secure political buy-in.

## Involved Stakeholders and roles

The stakeholders involved in the Connecting Nature NBS impact assessment process were the following:

- City planners and officers: they were in charge of detailing the NBS, as well as participating in the adaptation of the indicators to their cities. They were also the link to local organizations and communities for data collection.
- Science-practice partners: academics belonging to universities, who guided cities through the steps of the NBS impact assessment process. The collaboration was established through periodic meetings where the evaluation and monitoring plans for each city were developed.
- Consultant companies and SMEs: they had the function of interface with the cities to locate the stored knowledge of the NBS, and co-produce NBS catalogues and monitoring tools.

**Municipal Administrations (FR/FL)**

**Planning experts**

**Scientists / Academia**

**Schools and kindergartens**

**Consultant Companies and SMEs**

## Main Challenges addressed

**1. Climate Resilience**

**2. Water Management**

**3. Natural and Climate Hazards**

**4. Green Space Management**

**5. Biodiversity**

**6. Air Quality**

**7. Place Regeneration**

**8. Knowledge and Social Capacity Building**

**9. Participatory Planning and Governance**

**10. Social Justice and Social Cohesion**

**11. Health and Wellbeing**

**12. New Economic Opportunities & Green Jobs**

## Lessons learned

A key challenge has been the diversity of expertise within the city teams in relation to evaluation indicators. Some cities had little evaluation expertise in the area of nature-based solutions, while for others expertise in one area such as environmental indicators existed, but it was either housed in a different department or was provided by a university partner. One of the main lessons we all learned was how working co-productively with local teams, through regular meetings and mutual agreements for each of the impact assessment steps. In this way, training activities were carried out for cities in evaluation and monitoring competencies, but in addition, the importance of the impact assessment process was also explained and emphasized. As the local teams became empowered to design their NBS monitoring and evaluation plans, they increased their efforts aimed at understanding the real impact of their urban interventions.

**Learn more**

**<https://connectingnature.eu/>**

